Companies are to share their inputs on the excel spreadsheet in

<https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_107-e/Inbox/drafts/8.1.2.3/RRC> herein.

## Inputs on version 00

Please share your inputs, if any, in the following table

Issue #1: Regarding how to differentiate Rel-15/16 and Rel-17 group-based beam reporting procedure,

* Alt-1 (explicit): to introduce a RRC parameter groupBasedBeamReportingR17, e.g. *groupBasedBeamReportingR17*
  + (7) H3C, ZTE, InterDIgital, Nokia/NSB, NTT DOCOMO, OPPO, Samsung
* Alt-2 (implicit): to be based on the number of configured resource sets
  + (3) Huawei, HiSilicon, Futurewei, Lenovo/MotM

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support Alt-2. Similar to R16, there is no need to introduce a new RRC parameter. |
| Lenovo/MotM | We support Alt-2. It is unnecessary to have dedicated RRC parameter. There is no ambiguities without this RRC parameter when two CMR sets are configured. |
| H3C | Support Alt-1 |
| ZTE | Support Alt-1. We disagree with Huawei, but in fact, for Rel-16, we have new reporting quantities for Rel-16 SINR. Similarly, we need to have a RRC parameter for enabling this feature rather than being based on an implicit rule. |
| InterDigital | Support Alt-1 |
| Nokia/NSB | Support Alt-1 |
| Futurewei | Support Alt-2. |
| Mod2 | The above inputs for issue#1 are copied from FL summary of mTRP MB(round 2).  Comments to other parameters can be listed below. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support Alt-1. |
| OPPO | Alt1.  This proposal is essential to beam reporting option 2 and has impact on RRC. So we shall discuss it with high priority. |
| Samsung | Support Alt-1. |
| Mod3 | As shown above, inputs from OPPO and Samsung are copied from FL summary of mTRP MB(round 2). |

## Inputs on version XX

Please share your inputs, if any, in the following table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |